

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated August 4, 2008, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-6 and 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

As indicated above, claims 1, 5 and 11-12 have been amended in order to make explicit what is implicit in the claims. The amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Claims 1 and 11 claim an input method and claims 5 and 12 claim an input apparatus. The method and apparatus include a touch panel laminated onto a display screen of a display apparatus. A sensor unit is formed so as to be expanded to an outside of one side of the display screen. An instruction, according to a touching position of a finger or touch pen onto the sensor unit, is given. A controller generates a control signal based on the instruction. A selection display is displayed when the finger or touch pad is touched to the sensor unit. A selection item is highlighted when the finger or touch pen is near the selection item as the finger or touch pen remains in contact with the sensor unit and is moved along the sensor unit. The highlighted selection item is selected upon lifting the finger or touch pen from contact with the sensor unit near the highlighted selection item. A selection display is cancelled when the finger or the touch pen remains in contact while being moved from the sensor unit to the display screen on the touch panel.

By cancelling a selection display when the finger or touch pen remains in contact while being moved from the sensor unit to the display screen, as claimed in claims 1, 5, 11 and 12, the claimed invention provides an input method and apparatus which can cancel an operation by merely touching and releasing the contact with the display screen. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1, 5, 11 and 12.

Claims 1-2, 4-6, and 8-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Beernink, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,434,929) in view of *Dolan* (U.S. Patent No. 5,148,015).

Beernink, et al. appears to disclose a close box 94 that allows a user to quit a session by selecting/tapping on the close box (Col. 9, lines 15-19). Nothing in *Beernink, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests canceling a selection display when a finger or touch pen remains in contact while being moved from a sensor unit to the display screen as claimed in claims 1, 5, 11 and 12. Rather, *Beernink, et al.* only discloses tapping a close box 94 to quit a session (i.e. close box closes the window 72 but not the pseudo keypad 24).

Dolan appears to disclose pressing a bar 12 to execute a desired function (Col. 5, lines 27-30). Nothing in *Dolan* shows, teaches or suggests canceling a selection display when a finger or touch pen remains in contact while being moved from a sensor unit to the display screen as claimed in claims 1, 5, 11 and 12. Rather, *Dolan* merely discloses pressing a bar 12 to select an item.

A combination of *Beernink, et al.* and *Dolan* would merely suggest to replace the tapping motion of *Beernink, et al.* with the pressing of the bar as taught by *Dolan*. Thus, nothing in the combination of the references shows, teaches or suggests cancelling a selection display of a plurality of items along a side of the display screen when a finger or touch pen remains in contact while being moved from a sensor unit to the display screen as claimed in claims 1, 5, 11 and 12. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 1, 5, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 2, 4, 6, and 8-10 recite additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 4, 6 and 8-10 would not have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103 over *Beernink, et al.* and *Dolan*, at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants

respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 2, 4, 6, and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Thus, it now appears that the application is in condition for a reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner find that the application is not now in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner enters this amendment for purposes of appeal.

CONCLUSION

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By 

Ellen Marcie Emas
Reg. No. 32,131
(202) 292-1530

Date: October 3, 2008